THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVIII DECEMBER, 1945 No. 306

Editorial

THEOLOGY will be able to expand to 32 pages monthly from January onwards; this will afford some relief to our editorial embarrassments and, we hope, some satisfaction to our readers, who have had for too long to be content with a very restricted diet. It will also be possible to accept a certain number of new subscriptions. May we therefore once again suggest the suitability of an annual subscription to THEOLOGY as a Christmas present?

Many requests were received that the article on "Our Struggle," by the Rev. Frank Bennett, which was published in July, 1944, should be reprinted. This was not practicable at the time. But Mr Bennett has now been persuaded to develop the article into a book, entitled *Laodicea in the Twentieth Century, or The Church of England in the England of Today*, and it is being published by S.P.C.K. He has taken into account the comments on "Our Struggle" which were made in THEOLOGY and elsewhere after the appearance of the original article. We warmly commend this book, for we believe that it admirably defines what ought to be the strategy and expectations of the Church of England at the present time.

The advisory committee of THEOLOGY at its last meeting could not agree whether the feature "Our Contributors" ought to be restored, when more space is available. On the one hand, it was urged that readers like to know more than the names of writers, and that an indication of at least what office they hold facilitates the task of any who may wish to communicate with them. On the other hand, it was pointed out that it seems to be only theological and religious books and periodicals which supply this kind of information, and that it would be better if all writers made their way on their merits as writers without depending on the advertisement of their offices or honours. Why should you be told that you are being instructed, enlightened, bored or enraged by the Vicar of Puddlecombe, a Fellow of St Agnes, or the Headmistress of Pentrobin Grammar School? Before a decision is reached, the advisory committee will be glad to consider further arguments on one side or the other, if they are sent to the Editor before the end of December.

The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology—II

THE Caroline view of the relationship of moral theology to the general progress of the spiritual life, in which a "severe" concept of holiness rather than mere legality was the dominant element, led them to make several consequent reforms in the science. Desiring to avoid the pitfall mentioned by Davis, they considered that certain changes

in the doctrines of repentance and of mortal and venial sin were essential. To take the latter first: Romanists were wont to accuse Anglicans of teaching "a Jovinianish parity of sins" (the phrase is Hall's) because they denied that the distinction between mortal and venial sin was a true one. It should be recalled that the "objective" standard of what constituted a mortal sin had been dealt a death-blow by Abailard's *Scito Teipsum*, in which the subject of sin is no longer discussed solely in the terms of the external act, though there always remain, of course, sins which are mortal *suo genere*. There emerged inevitably, with the growth of stress on "deliberateness," a certain difficulty in establishing tests as to what was mortal and what was venial.

The Carolines saw the weak point. "Men call what they please venial," comments Jeremy Taylor. But, in their contention, the chief issue was the Roman claim that venial sin in its own proper nature differed from mortal sin. The Carolines took their stand on the words "all sin is anomia," maintaining that, if this be denied, venial sin may be regarded as being rather beside the law than against it, and as deserving only temporal punishment. A way would then be open for the acquisition of a kind of semi-permissibility by a whole class of sinful actions whose nature was alleged not to be malignant. "Men perish with whispering sins . . . . as often as with crying sins," says Donne, and he observes that the assertion that venial sin does not extinguish charity is about as much to the real point as to say that "a man were not hurt in his head, because he was not beheaded."

To do more than make brief reference to some other criticisms of the distinction is needless since all the Anglican divines share the conviction that to regard even slight sins as not partaking of a nature inimical to Christian holiness is perilous (cp. *Unum necessarium*, Chap. III, Sect. XIII). Sharp holds that the distinction encourages small sins to grow to the stature of habits, when they cease to be small. Hall states that it is bound up with indulgences; Taylor and Sanderson regard it as corrupting the body of moral theology. Again, it was suggested that the distinction made repentance insincere and imperfect, and that it gives men a false idea of their liberty and fails to discourage them from their course of sinning. The Caroline position may be summed up in a sentence: they held all sins to be equal in kind, but not in degree. To express this distinction, they use the terms "sins of presumption" and "sins of infirmity," or, as does Henry Hammond, "sins of wilfulness" and "weakness," classifying them from the cause.

This also has the virtue of connecting up with the analysis of human acts. Sanderson makes this clear by dividing sins into those proceeding from defects in will, understanding and affections, where the sinful act draws its denomination from that "faculty" which predominates. Some of the earlier writers, like Field and Thorndike, retain the word "venial" but make it clear, by excluding all idea of an inherent right to pardon by reason of the nature of the act, that it is the equivalent of the term which came to be the normal one. Hammond, Sanderson and Taylor, to mention but three, are careful in defining sins of infirmity, laying the main stress on the action of the will: "Nothing is a sin of infirmity; but what is, in some sense, involuntary" (Taylor).

They take the concept of the imperfect act, which includes the two traditional "tests" of mortal sin, full advertence and full consent, and show that a sin cannot be presumptuous when it has been occasioned by some non-culpable defect of the will. Rashness, ignorance and surprise are extenuating circumstances. They are severe on the traditional "slightness of matter." Taken together with "the imperfect way of acting," it is a necessary constituent of a sin of infirmity, but, alone, it cannot constitute a claim to "veniality." The smallest instance, if it be noted, ceases to be an infirmity, for it is then done "on account of the will."

The Carolines, therefore, pared down the conception of venial sin in two ways: first by denying that its nature was such as differentiated it from graver sin, and secondly by limiting the extent of the class of sins of infirmity.

South, for instance, cautions against a too facile context for the word "advertency." Taylor notes that sins of infirmity belong more often to omission than commission. Circumstances will, of course, make a light sin to be grave. Both Hammond and Taylor are on sure ground when they warn that all sins are not alike venial to all men, nor indeed to one man at different times, stressing the fact that hard-and-fast lines of demarcation are not always possible. But behind the Caroline attempt to close what they considered to be illegal emergency exits is the simple conviction, voiced by Hall: "All sins make us unlike him, as being contrary to his perfect holiness; but some show more direct contrariety." This same concern impelled them to make certain reforms in the matter of repentance, a sound doctrine of which, as Taylor maintained, was essential for a healthy moral theology. Here again they looked to Biblical categories, and drew their picture of repentance from the New Testament. The fundamental difference from Roman Catholic thought on this matter lies in the Caroline refusal to ground the doctrine of repentance on the sacrament of penance. And, once more, the formative influence in defining repentance was that "All must come to God through Jesus Christ in the measures and strictness of the evangelical holiness; which is that state of repentance . . . which is a perfect abrenunciation of all iniquity, and sincere obedience in the faith of Jesus Christ" (Taylor, *Unum necessarium*, II, Sect. II [10]).

Almost invariably the Anglicans regarded repentance as consisting, in Primate Wake's phrase, "in a *real Conversion*." Andrewes and Donne speak of this conversion as a double turning, away from sin and towards God. It embodies contrition, and together these "make up a compleat repentance" (Andrewes). They traced the obscuring of this basic idea of repentance by the idea of penance to the fact that the essential parts of repentance are indissolubly bound up with what they call, variously, the subsidiary parts, the fruits or the works of repentance—namely, fasting, prayer and almsdeeds—which the *Summa* terms the works of satisfaction. The part came to eclipse the whole, so that, in Donne's words, "salvation it selfe, which God gives upon repentance, hath been attributed to these post-penances . . . which because they alwaies accompany repentance, have sometimes been called repentance." As to satisfaction, they agree in denying that man can at all

satisfy God by penance, claiming that Ambrose, Augustine and others do not give to post-penances such a value. Nevertheless, the Carolines are careful to qualify these three externals as "excellent Duties," so long as they are not "mere outside, when God rejects them" (Sanderson). Our penances, says Taylor, are a judging of ourselves. We may not barter with God.

In support of our central thesis as to the Caroline view of the nature of moral theology being determined by the concept of a "strict holiness," we may refer to two other points connected with repentance. First, they denied that attrition coupled with sacramental confession was sufficient. They did not, after the manner of some Puritan firebrands (targets for Matthew Scrivener's irony on this score), term attrition the gate of Hell. They sensibly regarded it as disposing a man to repentance, but no more than that. They did not believe that attrition could be turned into contrition by the power of the keys. From Thorndike to Taylor and afterwards, the literature on this point is considerable, as it is on the second sorely controverted question, that of the validity of a death-bed repentance. On this subject also Caroline thought was uneasy at the prospect of an opening for laxness to creep in, and the *locus classicus* of the Penitent Thief has undergone much analysis.

In the aggregate, the Carolines warned men against presuming to defer their repentance, since the fundamental interests of the good life were thereby damaged. They would not counsel men to despair when suddenly surprised by fatal illness, but they could not hold out encouragement to those who hoped to have the best of both worlds.

This necessarily brief sketch, whilst omitting much that should be said, aims at laying bare something of the structure of Caroline practical divinity by drawing attention to two points: first, that Anglican thought has its own very definite view of the nature of moral theology and deals with its basic questions in Biblical terms, and second, that the determining element in the Anglican approach to the particular subsections of the science is that concept of holiness to which we have referred. The preface to the *Unum necessarium* sets the tone: "I have endeavoured to break in pieces almost all those propositions, upon the confidence of which men have been negligent of severe and strict living."

It has been frequently remarked of late that Caroline divinity gives us, not finality, but direction. In moral theology the Carolines did not neglect to erect signposts that wayfarers might not err.

Castleventry Rectory,
Rosscarbery, Co. Cork.

H. R. McAdoo.

(*Concluded.*)

A Poet of Gentle Depths

Poetry has never been just a polite pastime—not even in the day of Elizabethan lovers or the heyday of the Victorian drawing-room when music was regarded as a social accomplishment; but there were Victorians, even great ones, who seemed to imagine that an author was obliged to turn out poetry on occasions. Even Thackeray and

George Eliot made the attempt, though both were failures at poetry; but to Christina Rossetti (who achieved nothing like the artistic or intellectual stature of either) the game was almost second nature. For to her, it was very nearly a game. As a child she never cared for books. She did not read—but preferred to write; and at seventeen could write a poem which, despite its rather callow gravity and undeveloped technique, is astonishingly mature in its perception:

When I am dead, my dearest,
Sing no sad songs for me;
Plant thou no roses at my head,
Nor shady cypress tree:
Be the green grass above me
With showers and dewdrops wet;
And if thou wilt, remember,
And if thou wilt, forget.

I shall not see the shadows,
I shall not feel the rain;
I shall not hear the nightingale
Sing on, as if in pain:
And dreaming through the twilight
That doth not rise nor set,
Haply I may remember,
And haply may forget.

The poem is worth quoting in full because it is an instance of that genius for simplicity and directness which Christina Rossetti never lost throughout her life. It is of course full of echoes—that "green grass," "dreaming through the twilight," "dewdrops wet" and the "shady cypress tree" had been worn nearly threadbare in poetry a long while before Christina's day. Much, if not all of it, is second-hand if broken up into fragments; but Christina realized in a large measure what Henry Vaughan and perhaps John Clare realized in supreme measure, that what I can best describe as "context and direction" in poetic diction are quite as important as incidental phraseology, and those words and phrases which have had all the life-blood sucked out of them by constant usage can be replenished and reinvigorated by being made to look in an unusual direction or to foster some unexpected climax. Here it is achieved in a slight and only partially successful manner; but even in her ripest maturity she achieves an original effect out of what are really only poetic echoes:

Passing away, saith my soul, passing away
With its burden of fear and hope, labour and play,
Hearken what the past doth witness and say:
Rust in thy gold, a moth is in thine array,
A canker is in thy bud, thy leaves must decay.
At midnight, at cockcrow, at morning, one certain day,
Lo! the Bridegroom shall come and shall not delay;
Watch thou and pray.

There is much in this that would be mere *cliché* were it not for the sensitive dramatization of the great theme of approaching judgment—the shadow stealing over the words as they build up their climax of

quiet pity and terror. For Christina's darkness was never the darkness of a Dante or a Beethoven—nor that of the great mystics like Augustine or St John of the Cross. It was much more like the occasional darkness of a Shakespearean comedy or a Mozart symphony—something that we feel has been there all the time but of which we have only occasional glimpses. There was a streak of Calvinism in her make-up that would seem to belong to the English temperament—the same streak that too bluntly discolours the English Prayer-Book; and perhaps neither she nor the Prayer-Book ever resolved it, ever digested it, with the result that, if regarded in isolation, it looks a little odd in both! And in Christina, who was much more Italian than English, it is a baffling enigma—though it may account for the fact that she remained an ardent High Anglican to the end of her life, despite her Latin origin and the then exciting path to Rome.

It is probably true that her "purity" as a poet saved her from those visions of the craven depths that either make or break great human genius. They made Shakespeare and Beethoven, of course, but even Blake trembled on the edge of them, and I think it certain they would have broken to fragments the delicate spontaneity of Christina Rossetti. There were no profundities in her. Her depths were gentle and her heights were correspondingly slopes, and I do not say this because she wrote only chamber-music. There is a terror, a fire in parts of the Beethoven quartets that would outmatch many a symphonic thunder from a lesser mind; but the fact that Christina *did* write only chamber-music is not unrelated to the small size of her particular genius. It was all part of that finesse which has made her the Queen of Amateur Poetry Societies and Discussion Groups as well as the miniature painter in words to whom such different poets as Swinburne, de la Mare and her own brother Dante Gabriel have all paid high tribute.

The influence of Dante Gabriel upon her might have been fatal were it not for that refusal of hers to be coaxed into writing what did not come to her by inspiration. He was aware of a certain crushed bewilderment in some of her verses; and of "Sleep at Sea" (which Professor Saintsbury once placed among the six greatest devotional poems in the language) said: "I wish you would try only rendering, narrative or sentiment, from real abundant nature, which presents much more variety, even in any one of its phases, than all such dreamings."

> Sound the deep waters:
> Who shall sound that deep?
> Too short the plummet,
> And the watchmen sleep.
> Some dream of effort
> Up a toilsome steep;
> Some dream of pasture grounds
> For harmless sheep.

Dante Gabriel was no doubt annoyed by a certain narrowness in this vision—even a "daintiness" in Christina's technique; but it was rash and irresponsible advice he was giving her. She could no more play havoc with the elements than could those seventeenth-century Anglican poets who were her spiritual forebears. Even Donne (the greatest of

them) was less concerned with the elements than with the rust and corruption of Man and his universe. Plenty of poets have given us the fire and the earthquake; but to Christina belonged the still, small voice of pathos and of mourning. There is a remarkable similarity, I always think, between her art and that of the composer Chopin. Both spoke with a quiet intensity which sometimes (but not often) swelled into a passionate *virtuoso*; and both dealt in pathos rather than tragedy—or in personal joy rather than in universal triumph, though there are just moments when Christina's music catches the flash and frenzy of a Beethoven *scherzo* in a quartet.

High above and deep below,
Bursting, bubbling, swelling the flow,
Like hill torrents after the snow—
Bubbling, gurgling, in whirling strife,
Swaying, sweeping to and fro—
He must swim for his life.

Which way?—which way? His eyes grew dim
With the dizzying whirl—which way to swim?
The thunderous downshoot deafened him;
Half he choked in the lashing spray:
Life is sweet, and the grave is grim—
Which way?—which way?

Even here, though, the note is personal—not finally elemental or universal; and it was only in her religious verse that she achieved total emancipation from the subjective. She wrote in an age when much religious poetry appeared—when Browning preached and Tennyson pontificated and Emily Brontë was a voice crying in the wilderness. Then there was the Roman Catholic school—Francis Thompson, Alice Meynell and Coventry Patmore; but their poetry was as much like Christina Rossetti's (though all, I think, were artistically greater) as the gardens which sprout in a cathedral city are like the flowers which blossom and blow by the wayside. There was a freshness, even a wildness, about Christina's art that makes one feel that the whole pattern came into being by accident—like the song of a thrush, or a snowstorm, or a rainbow; and it was Dante Gabriel's attempt to artificialize her that made him a damaging influence during her formative years. "Goblin Market" is full of this kind of radiance; and, if it is touched with the glow of sunset in "Monna Innominata," it is still the radiance of Nature that we see. Darkness, light, richness and human poverty, are gently crystallized by her into a single picture:

In the bleak midwinter
Frosty wind made moan,
Earth stood hard as iron—
Water like a stone.
Snow was falling—snow on snow,
Snow on snow;
In the bleak midwinter
Long ago.

After that the poem deteriorates somewhat artistically—if not devotionally; but that little piece is Christina at her very best, solidly true to the darkness of earth and yet the whole thing illuminated by the light of heaven—as an English winter seen in the glow of Christmas. Poets all down the ages have caught something of this radiance; but I think none ever captured the spirit of the Christmas carol with a keener intensity and yet a more glowing sense of realism than Christina Rossetti in this poem. It is one of the few occasions in which she struck a new meaning out of words—when dark and grim realities became things of tenderness and supernatural radiance—giving the lie to so much that was pantheistic in the nature poetry of her day.

Generally, however, as we have seen, her verses echoed the imagery of others, though her method of manipulating the echoes gave them an authentic music of their own. It is only when they linger too long in the ear that they begin to grow stale and rather unbearably familiar; but no great body of literature was known to her out of which such echoes could be forged. She read Scott and Dickens in her youth—but never Rabelais (who would have filled her with horror) or even her own native Boccaccio. The Bible, St Augustine and the *Imitation* she knew well; but of science and "pure" philosophy she knew nothing. She read contemporary English poetry, though apparently not much in French or Italian. In fact, Italy claimed little of her—soul or body—despite the fact that its warm blood was in her. Indeed, she once wrote of her return from there to England:

> To come back from the sweet South to the North,
> Where I was born, bred, look to die;
> Come back to my day's work in its day,
> Play out my play—
> Amen, amen, say I.

She shared with the country of her adoption certain well-defined aspirations and limitations—a love of simple things and not so much a horror of extremes as an almost invincible ignorance of them. Pain, passion, desire and deprivation were certainly not unknown to her; but these things were the result of a frailty in the body or a canker worm in the soul—not matters for too richly regretting—still less for "gloating." To her God was the single awful reality and religion a matter of terrible alternatives. This gave salt to her soul and a fire to her religious poetry which was often lacking from even the more daring poets of her day, so that what her poetry lacked in range it atoned for with green and gentle depths.

Ashley Sampson.

London.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

The name of Christianity has been made to cover some queer doings in the past—*e.g.*, the forcible conversion of the West Indies in the first part of the sixteenth century and the wars of religion in the

latter part—but I confess myself a trifle shocked to find it, in a contribution to your October number, being mixed up with the "Punishment of War Criminals" racket. As I write, there has been revived at a London cinema a film entitled *Strange Incident*. The film depicts the lynching of one man for the murder of another, not only with whom he has had nothing to do, but also who is discovered in the end to be still alive. The plane on which that kind of "incident" is to be discussed is the appropriate plane for discussing the racket in question. Attempts, however well meant, to remove it from that plane up to the level of the Christian duty of forgiveness, and then somehow to equate forgiveness and punishment, argue either an ignorance of patent facts which is inexcusable or an ignoring of them which is hypocritical.

In the contribution I refer to, Canon Hawkins declares himself to believe that it is right our late enemies in general should be punished, but neglects to state for what or to justify this alleged belief of his with either Christian or other doctrine. Regarding the arraignment of so-called "war criminals" in particular, the fundamental facts are that, in the first place, the courts before which the so-called "trials" are taking or are about to take place lack jurisdiction, and that, in the second place, the so-called "war criminals" are being picked out exclusively from the ranks of the defeated when only an egregious crassitude can suppose that, if "war criminals" there are, they must be in those ranks alone.

Regarding jurisdiction, it has ever been of the essence of European jurisprudence that for any law to be transgressed that law must actually be in force. There can be no transgression of laws put into operation after the event. The offences with which "war criminals" so called are being charged were every one of them committed, if committed at all, while the alleged offenders were under German law, and that they transgressed German law is a question solely for the German courts —abolished with the abolition of German government—to decide. Furthermore, so long as they were under German law, they were under no other law. It is significant that the president of the court "trying" the persons alleged to have been in charge of the concentration camp at Belsen stated on September 27, upon leave being asked to call Colonel H. A. Smith, professor of international law in the University of London, that he would not allow such a witness to challenge the competence of the court. One could hardly indicate more clearly that the competence is questionable. In fact, with the holding of these "trials" two thousand years of jurisprudence go by the board, and the consequences for the future are disquieting to think of.

Regarding the selection of the so-called "war criminals" exclusively from the ranks of the defeated, Canon Hawkins remembers to mention that in "trying" them we are both accusers and judges, and also often injured parties as well, but fails to consider that, if crimes there are, we are likewise fellow-criminals. Yet it is only if that consideration—in the opinion at least of Plato (*Republic*, 409, D, E), a ground of incompetence in itself—is steadily kept in view that the ferocious irony of the "trials" can be savoured to the full.

The so-called "war criminals" are made up of "big shots" and small fry.

Regarding the "big shots," the individual share in having brought about the war of "leaders" and publicists on the side which has had the good fortune to emerge victorious from it has not been and is not being inquired into. But, assuming individual human responsibility to be involved at all, the whole of history, and also incidentally the article by Mr J. L. Garvin in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on the "War Guilt" of 1914, are dead against the existence of that responsibility on one side only. The present temper in England concerning the defeated seems to reflect the principle implied in the view that Germans are congenitally incapable of observing the terms of a dictated peace because they are cads, but that when the French flouted the terms of the armistice they signed with the Germans they were patriots. The principle is possibly good enough for Mr Eden and other politicians of his kidney, but that it should be professed with smug complacency by men styling themselves Christian priests hardly redounds to the credit of the Church.

Regarding the small fry, there is nothing of which the defeated are accused that the victors cannot be found to have done or to be doing. Was the alleged gas chamber any less humane than are the reported mass expulsions of Germans from Polish-annexed Germany or from the Sudetenland? Is it established that the soldiers of the United Nations never despatched in cold blood prisoners of war or disarmed foes? Mass executions? In March, 1941, at Katyn, in Russian-annexed Poland, 14,500 Polish soldiers, 8,500 of them officers, were massacred, and it has still to be shown that Katyn was unique. Internment camps? Conditions in Russian, French, American, and even English internment camps have not been investigated. I count myself lucky to have been a British officer detained in Germany rather than a German refugee at Aintree, but the camps I mean are of course those on the Continent. Why not investigate them? Why confine the spotlight to the German? Torture? See Alan Moorehead (*Daily Express* correspondent) in *Horizon* for July. Starvation? At Belsen some internees, it appears, died from lack of food as soon as ten days after admission. Their agony was short. The United Nations, as a result of their insistence on obtaining "unconditional surrender," are in process of condemning a large part of the German nation to death from undernourishment (700 calories a day) and seem resolved that the agony shall be prolonged for months. Slave labour? The Russians, with, it is reported, eighteen millions in their forced-labour camps, specialize in utilizing foreign slave labour, and the French boast of having a million German prisoners available indefinitely for the work of "reconstruction." Loot? Military law penalizes looting heavily, and yet since the Allied armies set foot on the territory of the defeated looting on a colossal scale has been taking place with impunity from the very highest level—loot of chemical formulæ and industrial secrets—down to the humblest G.I. or displaced person who steals a bottle of drink or a pair of shoes.

Of course two wrongs do not make a right. Twenty to thirty years ago, during a vogue for ridiculing humanitarianism, the gospel of "the survival of the fittest" had its doughty champions: even they might be

hard put today to defend needless bestiality. Nevertheless, justice, like charity, is perhaps best begun at home. Canon Hawkins contends that the German so-called "war criminals" are going to be grateful to their judges because in being punished they will obtain their just deserts. In view of the utter lack of qualification in the victors to sit in judgment upon them, it is more likely that they will feel that their only crime has been to be vanquished.

But it is we, the victorious, who in the sequel will be the greater sufferers if we persist in answering the ever-recurrent question of the Gospel, "And who is my neighbour?" by going among our late enemies and boasting like Pharisees of a grace in which we are so obviously deficient.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.
September 29, 1945.

Canon Hawkins writes:

The intention which lay behind my article was:

1. To emphasize the inevitably defective character of human justice.
2. To maintain that, while our own hands are not clean, it is yet our duty as men both to judge and to punish our fellow-men (John v, 27, R.V. margin).
3. To uphold the now popularly discredited theory of retributive punishment.
4. To protest against the common assumption that we have to choose between punishment *or* forgiveness.
5. To leave in the reader's mind the (admittedly not stated) conclusion, that there is required of us and of our Allies at the present time a very high degree of humility and godly fear if we are to judge and to punish aright.

"PROSPECT FOR CHRISTENDOM"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The convention which commonly restrains an author from proposing and an editor from encouraging a reply to the review of a book has wisdom for its foundation. For an author can hardly be supposed to take a purely objective view of his own creation, while it can ordinarily be presumed that a reviewer has no natural inclination to depart from a disinterested consideration of it.

But it is recognized that there may be cases when a rejoinder to a review is justified by its contributing to clarify the matter under discussion, and Mr Brewin's review of the corporate volume *Prospect for Christendom* in your September number provides an occasion for such a reply, and indeed may almost be said to demand one. I am perhaps the less disqualified from supplying this since not only am I the editor of the book, and have thus had special opportunities of considering it as a whole, but, along with eight other contributors to what was explicitly a corporate effort, I am not referred to in Mr Brewin's highly selective notice. Your readers are not told that writers of the calibre of Mr T. S. Eliot, Mr Philip Mairet, Canon Charles Smyth and Canon Cyril Hudson (to name but a few) have any share in the book at all.

An editor may perhaps be permitted to complain that the scope and character of a volume which was the upshot of several years' carefully concerted work is scarcely hinted at by Mr Brewin. His omission to say anything about the plan of the book, his cursory treatment (and in a journal entitled *Theology*) of the section named "Foundations" which occupies more than a third of it, and his decision to concentrate four-fifths of his review on the subject-matter of two sociological essays, suggests that a certain *odium sociologicum* has entered into his handling of the volume in such a way as seriously to injure the perspective of his notice.

Your reviewer professes to be "speaking the truth in love." This is a moral obligation which Mr Brewin has felt it incumbent on him to accept before in respect of the Group from which this book proceeds, though without convincing all those who have attended to him that he is in fact exhibiting much of either of these virtues. A few months ago Mr Brewin conceived it to be his duty to enlighten American readers, through the medium of Dr Niebuhr's journal *Christianity and Crisis*, upon the sociological shortcomings of the Christendom Group in an article which drew down protests against its misleading character from a source quite outside the Group itself. If I mention these matters it is not to complain that our Group should be criticized, still less to suggest that any great significance attaches to criticisms from quarters which Mr Brewin represents. I do so to indicate that your reviewer may not have approached our book with that absence of prejudice desirable in any reviewer, and more particularly so in one who proclaims so explicitly that not only is his object truth but that his mood is one of love. If Christian controversy is to be carried on in the tone of his notice then its author's professed desire to "work out a more satisfactory synthesis of Christian thought about the secular order" is unlikely to find fulfilment. Truth may be a matter of opinion, but there can hardly be two opinions about the degree or the quality of the love which his review displays.

All this is the more unfortunate since, gravely as Mr Brewin's manner of writing obscures them, there would seem to be important issues at stake between the school for which he speaks and our own, issues which will never be clarified by indulgence in mere abuse. This is suggested by his bland declaration that "we prefer less enlightened to more enlightened thought." By what standard is this "enlightenment" to be assessed? If this statement means anything more than a claim that Mr Brewin's opinions are necessarily entitled to a higher degree of respect than those of the sixteen contributors to our book, it must mean that at this point of human history there has emerged a *corpus* of sociological and economic thought of such inherent authority that whatever may have been held to have been Christian principles at any past time, have got to be revised and re-stated in order to conform with it. I suppose this position could be argued, though there might seem a good many reasons for questioning it; but Mr Brewin, like others of his school, does not argue it. He merely affirms it, and abuses those Christian writers who seek to make a more autochthonous judgment on the predicament of a secularized civilization. There is no exposition

of this new orthodoxy, nor any genuine criticism of our assumed deviations from it. Mr Brewin complains of our "grossly unfair attacks on men of science" and "incredibly unjust attacks on economists," but he nowhere specifies where in our book these are to be found nor even what is the content of them. Is it too much to expect that a reviewer should deal with what a book actually does say and not what he assumes that its authors might have said? It really seems as if Mr Brewin is plunged into such a state of emotion by finding that what he accepts (for whatever reason) as irrefragable orthodoxy in the sociological sphere is not accepted by other Christians as on the same plane as religious orthodoxy, that he is quite incapable of discussing, or even grasping, what is actually being said in the book he is supposed to be reviewing.

It seems to me that the essence of the difference between Mr Brewin and ourselves is that he accepts the modern world at its own valuation and we do not. I don't mean of course that we should suppose that he does not desire its improvement along certain well-established lines, or that he would suppose that we are not ready to cope, so far as may be, with the situation into which we have been born. That is not the issue between us. But Mr Brewin seems to believe that that which is at any historic moment is the only reality and that the Christian has got to come to terms with it *on the assumptions which it lays down.* This essentially Liberal Protestant position is complicated in this instance by the infusion of certain Neo-Calvinist odds and ends which Mr Brewin has dropped in here and there. But it is not surprising that the resulting "position" (if it can be called such) should come into collision with the standpoint of a volume of "Essays in Catholic Social Reconstruction," to quote the sub-title of our book. We do not believe that what has happened to our society is the only thing that could have happened to it; or what ought to have happened to it; or, if a valid guardianship of social aims had been preserved by the Church (which it certainly was not), what would have happened to it. George the Third, says a contemporary poet, ought never to have occurred. Our economically unbalanced, agronomically destructive and psychologically frustrated world disorder ought never to have occurred. It has developed through man's disobedience to the truly human social norms (out of consideration for Mr Brewin I will not import "Natural Law" into this discussion). We shall only find our way out of it by the repudiation of that disobedience. If the implications of this standpoint are too revolutionary for Mr Brewin, whether as theologian or sociologist, well, that's just too bad. We have never claimed to "reflect what is advocated by the most enlightened thought of the time."

It has seemed more important to attempt to elucidate the basic issues between us than to discuss Mr Brewin's strictures on the only two essays to which he gave any sustained attention. All I would plead for is that your readers should study these essays for themselves instead of accepting Mr Brewin's estimate of their work or account of their argument. But there is one statement made by Mr Brewin in the course of his criticism of Mr McLaughlin's essay which reveals so plainly the issues between us that it cannot go altogether without comment.

"The soil," says Mr Brewin, "is made for man, not man for the soil." It would be difficult to construct an antithesis which more plainly exhibited (to adopt one of Mr Brewin's loving expressions) "the nightmare of undisciplined thought." If this statement means anything, it means that man has unlimited rights over the soil but no duties in regard to it. The consequences of this outlook are before us in the deserts and "dust bowls" of the world, and how the proliferation of these, which a reckless use of agricultural machinery now vastly facilitates, is to serve Mr Brewin's desire "to feed the people" is not obvious, unless "the people" are to cash in on what remains of the fertility of the earth at the expense of all future generations. Even if Mr Brewin is prepared to deny all except quantitative values on the productive side of human economy, even if he denies to the countryman any rights to his own way of life, and would cheerfully depopulate the countryside in the (alleged) interests of maximum "output," leaving the "redundant" rural worker to stand in an urban bread queue, one would have thought that he would have had some concern for the land itself regarded, if not as a trusteeship from God, then at least as national capital.[1] I say nothing of an attitude to the land which would be congruous with a worshipful attitude towards its Creator, since this might seem to indicate a preference for less enlightened over more enlightened thought.

A final word requires, unfortunately, to be said. Near the end of his review Mr Brewin refers to two documents of which your readers can have no cognizance, since they have never been published. Neither of these documents had any connexion whatever with the book Mr Brewin was supposed to be reviewing. One was a report prepared at the request of the Council for the Church and Countryside to form the basis of a discussion at one of its meetings, the other was a private letter to its acting secretary, read at his discretion for the information of the meeting. Mr Brewin attended this meeting by invitation; that he should make such a use as he has of documents of this kind is, in the opinion of the Committee of the Council, a scandalous breach of trust, and this opinion has been communicated to those whom he was appointed to represent. It is unhappily only too indicative of the spirit in which Mr Brewin has entered upon what might have been a fruitful discussion of Christian sociological issues.

Yours faithfully,
MAURICE B. RECKITT.

[The Rev. E. W. Brewin will have an opportunity of replying in January.—ED. THEOLOGY.]

[1] The world is suffering from a shortage of earth. This paradoxical conclusion is reached by the soil conservation service of the Department of Agriculture, which, as a result of a "rough survey of the world," finds that "there is no longer an abundance of good productive land to feed and clothe the peoples of the world." Reported by G. E. Neyroud in "American Diary," *News Chronicle*, September, 1945.

BOOK REVIEWS

CLINICAL PASTORAL TRAINING. Edited by Seward Hiltner. Commission on Religion and Health, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. $1.

It used to be said that "the ideal of the Church of England is to maintain a resident gentleman in every parish; and there have been worse ideals." Of course there have been better ones. The "enlightened gentleman amateur" is no longer anywhere regarded as *ipso facto* qualified, without further training and study, for the cure of souls. There are still, notoriously, occasions when this principle is flouted; but the new emphasis on priest*craft*—on professional training, competence, technique—is now generally accepted. It has its dangers; even such a book as this seems to be aware of them. No amount of technical training or professional ability can compensate, by itself, for what the true "parson" was and still is in the parish which has retained even a formal pattern of community.

This emphasis is in part the product, in part the cause, of a change in status and function—a change which is even more evident in the medical profession, where it has aroused much misgiving and a good deal of valuable introspection. The eclipse of the "gentleman parson," and the modern stress on technical—now "clinical"—training for the ministry are, taken together, simply one aspect and example of a significant "transference" in our society. The core of our social situation consists in the virtual disintegration of the middle class as a self-conscious *social* group, and its replacement by a group of *functional* significance—of men and women trained in the technical means and processes by which society is changed, but with no controlling idea of the purpose of human society and the ends of human life, and so assailed by spiritual weakness, irresolution, and frustration. The change in the *status* of the parson, that is to say, has been brought about by forces which have effected that kind of change throughout our whole society. But if we consider not his *status* but his "*dynamics*," we must say of him almost precisely the opposite of what must be said about most people in other professions. It is not (may we say, *ex hypothesi*) an uncertainty about *ends* that makes our pastoral work ineffective, but the poverty of our *means*. How many priests who, in later life, appear to be resigned to (if not content with) a dreary routine of rather irrelevant employments and artificial devotions have become so because, when confronted with the personal problems and domestic crises of their flocks, they found themselves unprepared, ill equipped, and ineffectual? As it is written on p. 84 of this volume of essays: "A young minister . . . often ventures into difficult situations without much chance of success and without learning much from the experience. Being unable to cope with the problems encountered, he tends to repeat mistakes and to skirt the real issues. The result is likely to be a growing distaste for pastoral work, the avoidance of many situations where the pastor is most needed, and a feeling of inadequacy that minimizes the chance of success."

Clinical Pastoral Training is a collection of some thirty-odd papers con-

tributed to a National Conference on Clinical Training in Theological Education, held at Pittsburgh in June of last year. Not all of them will be of equal interest to English readers. The Conference reviewed the achievements, status, progress and prospects of a movement which (it is repeatedly affirmed) must remain within the general framework and structure of theological education as a whole. It is a movement which has developed much further in the United States than here. It may be doubted, for instance, whether the value of clinical training—case-work, ward visits, and similar experience in different types of hospital—could be as easily taken for granted by a representative English group of clergy as it was by this conference. The specimen curricula presented are—considering the limited time available for them—well balanced and arranged (it is a little surprising to find such subjects as "Worship and Prayer" included at all). However, it is plain—less from the programs drawn up than from the content of the speeches made at the conference—that the main interest throughout is in the psychological knowledge and techniques which the student may hope to acquire in the course of such training. For example, on p. 82 it is asserted that "the greatest need of the pastoral ministry is the wise application of the findings of the sciences to pastoral problems." "The sciences" are later defined as "the medical and psychological sciences." This raises a host of questions, not to say misgivings. No sensible person would nowadays dispute that psychologists, past and present, have contributed enormously to our understanding of human behaviour and personality; or that "pastoralia" has benefited much, and might benefit more, from their researches. But to talk of the "application" (even the qualifying "wise" is hardly a mitigation) "of the findings of . . . psychology" to pastoral problems, suggests a too simple view of the present position of "psychology," and, it must be added, a too sanguine estimate of the abilities possessed by most young clergy. I am anxious not to be misconstrued. If, as part of pre- and post-ordination training, those called to the ministry can be made familiar with the methods of psychiatric practice (various as these are), and the limits within which the psychiatrist—one had better say, a particular psychiatrist—can operate with some hope of success, so much the better. The widespread disillusion which exists today in relation to "psychology" (no more precisely defined) is to be resisted most of all by those who must necessarily, if they would be faithful and effective pastors, use some part at least of the psychologist's technique. It is because the psychologist has so often claimed to be a *priest*—to open the way into eternal life—that he has brought confusion into his own world. For the priest "proper" to see himself as equipped for his pastoral task mainly by *clinical* training is to court a disenchantment even more profound.

The distinguished authors of this symposium would, I feel sure, protest that they see this danger. Yet on page after page there is written what leads one to doubt it. "The clinical approach to pastoral problems is the minister's laboratory" (p. 83). Pastoral training must have the "solid undergirding *of science*" (p. 86, my italics). Robert D. Morris, writing as an Anglican and apparently as an avowed sacramentalist,

can yet speak of "confession" as if its *effect* was substantially the same whether it were made to a priest in the confessional or to a clinical student by the bedside. Philip Guiles quotes with approbation "Richard C. Cabot's dreams that a 'clinical theology' would some day emerge which would serve as supplementary or corroborative to revealed theology. He even hoped it might in some instances be a corrective."

Such presuppositions are not to be lightly dismissed. They are grounded, ultimately, on the view that what psychologists are investigating is "Man as he really is." The Christian retort is that *no one* can do this—the alleged field of research just is not there. All science can do is give a more and more detailed account of Man who is not "himself" at all, whose true nature is lost until Christ restores it. This is not to say that psychology has nothing to teach us—only that what it can teach us must be seen in the perspective of our Faith; in particular, our Faith about Man. But to make the *basis* of our pastoral work the "findings" (so called) of psychology is simply to build upon sand.

Nevertheless, it will be a pity if those who must vigorously dissent from these assumptions fail, for that reason, to assess at their proper value the information collected and the material analysed at this most important conference. If we protest (as we do incessantly) that the object of better pastoral training is not to turn out amateur psychiatrists, we have not yet defined, at least with the requisite precision, just *what* the objective is. It is not enough to say, "a more competent clergy": competent to do *what*? Much of this book would form useful material for the discussions now going on in this country on the content of theological training, and it is especially to be commended to those with responsibility for reshaping the pattern of that training in our universities and theological colleges—and for those already ordained.

GILBERT RUSSELL.

LONDON.

ORTHODOX SPIRITUALITY: An Outline of the Orthodox Ascetical and Mystical Tradition by a Monk of the Eastern Church. S.P.C.K. for the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius. 5s.

This book merits to be read with close attention not only by those who are specially interested in the Eastern Orthodox Church but by all who desire to enter into the treasures of Christian spirituality. The author deals with a large subject in an incredibly small space; he therefore keeps to the main road and refuses to stray down by-paths however attractive, interesting or even important they may be. We could wish sometimes that he had dealt more fully with some of the by-paths; that, however, was not his purpose, and he is probably right. He sets out to provide "a short and very simple introduction to the *first principles* of the spirituality of the Eastern Orthodox Church," and that he has done admirably. So far as I know no one has yet attempted to do this in English (the nearest approach probably being the translation of Arseniew's *Mysticism and the Eastern Church*), and it badly needed doing.

The author is to be congratulated on a valuable guide-book written with lucidity and discretion.

The main sources of Orthodox spirituality are shown to be four: Holy Scripture, the definitions of the Councils, the liturgical texts, and the Fathers, and of these last particularly SS. John Chrysostom, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen. Two important points emerge from this: (1) Orthodox spirituality is primarily theological and liturgical. So also is the best Western spirituality, but we have come to rely overmuch upon psychology and the personal experiences of contemplative saints, both important but requiring, as writers like Stoltz and Graham have pointed out, just the theological foundation which is indigenous to the East. (2) As the author himself says, "It cannot be too often repeated there is no chasm between Eastern and Western Christianity. The fundamental principles of Christian spirituality are the same in the East and in the West; the methods are very often alike; the differences do not bear on the chief points. On the whole there is *one* Christian spirituality with, here and there, some variations of stress and emphasis." This judgment is abundantly justified in the course of the book, and it is for that reason that I venture to commend it to those who are not specially interested in the East. The fundamental unity is attested not only by the fact that the East gave the Greek Fathers to the West but also by the fact that the West gave SS. Jerome and Gregory the Great (Dialogos) to the East. The great tradition is neither Eastern nor Western, but Catholic.

I have noticed a few slips. "Ascetism" is not English; it should be "asceticism." Stoltz's *Theologie der Mystik* (noted on p. xii) was translated into English and published by Herder in 1938 under the title of *The Doctrine of Spiritual Perfection.*

F. P. Harton.

Baulking.

A Great Time to be Alive. By H. E. Fosdick. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

Included in this volume of war-time sermons is one preached on the fortieth anniversary of Dr Fosdick's ordination to the Christian ministry. In it he contrasts the problem of Liberal Christians forty years ago and now. "Then we were trying to accommodate Christ to our scientific civilization: now we face the desperate need of accommodating our scientific civilization to Christ." These war-time sermons are an excellent example of the attempt to bring the problems of modern scientific civilization under the searching judgment of Christ on the part of a Liberal Protestant. Christian humanism is set forth attractively, in the midst of all the ghastliness of our time, hope of a better order is triumphant, and it is "a great time to be alive." The preacher is far from being unaware of the changed scene of theological thought from the heyday of Liberal Protestantism, but for him the essentials of Christian humanism remain. Personal, social, political and economic morality are the constant themes of these sermons, and undoubtedly the Christian character of this teaching reveals a humanistic ideal, liberated from narrowness, insularity and isolationism. There is a strong sense of Universal Judgment and Touchstone over

the particular policies of men and nations. This world would contain the conditions of a happier life if men obeyed this teaching. But these are sermons preached at Christian worship; it is impossible in the printed word of the sermon to express the tone of the worship at which the sermon is preached. One must fill in the gaps with echoes of the hymns, psalms and prayers, with their solemnity and warm devotion. Only very occasionally do the preacher's words lead one to the feelings of awe and worship, to the cries for mercy, to the inspirations which lead to direct devotion. He is almost wholly concerned with telling men what they ought to do in view of current events, problems and anniversaries, and all this proceeding from a mind steeped in a rich tradition of Christian humanism. The theological beliefs from which this tradition is derived do not *pulsate* through the sermons. Occasionally there is a whisper of grace, devotion and the "over-plus" of faith. They are very unlike the beliefs which generate the New Testament and the liturgies of Christendom. Yet one cannot deny that practical Christian works are inculcated with great eloquence, large charity and just insight. The concluding sermon on Immortality is almost too typical of an impression which the whole book gives. The argument is based on man and his convictions; the result seems by ordinary rational argument to be vagueness itself, or more popularly "wishful thinking." Since there is hardly a mention of it in the sermon we can only hope the congregation were allowed to sing "Jesus Christ is risen today."

Cyril Gardner.

Wantage.

Many Creeds: One Cross. By Christopher E. Storrs. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

This useful book is the substance of lectures delivered by Archdeacon Storrs in the cathedral, Melbourne, in 1943. It sets out to give a survey of world religions against the background of a firmly-held faith in the revelation of the love of God in Christ.

Such a book has to steer a course between two extremes which beset the Christian: on the one hand there is the theosophical belief that all religions are ultimately one and that distinctions do not matter; on the other the transcendentalism of Barth and Kramer which insists that there is no "natural theology" and that between non-Christian faiths and the biblical revelation there is simply "no contact."

In other words, the missionary has to maintain a position which is neither one of "religious imperialism" nor of an unrealistic syncretism. Despite Kramer it is impossible for an Anglican to deny some degree of the knowledge of God and the good life to the non-Christian. Bishop Westcott used to say that every missionary to India should be armed with the Fourth Gospel and the writings of St Clement of Alexandria. There is a light "that lighteth every man," and cautiously but surely Mr Storrs reaffirms the belief in Christ as "the Logos Spermatikos." With this background, which ensures both a capacity for sympathetic appreciation and true criticism, Mr Storrs proceeds to consider in successive chapters Hinduism, Buddhism,

Islam, Chinese Humanism (Confucius), and the mystical nationalism (Shinto) of Japan. The last two chapters permit the author to expand his theme to include some consideration of humanism and state worship in general.

In a book so slight it is inevitable that a Hindu or Muslim, for example, would find occasion of offence and that large matters are handled in a fashion too brief to be conclusive, thereby giving an impression of neat dogmatism so annoying except to the converted; but for the most part the book is charitable and valuable.

We live in a world where we can no longer afford to have a provincial outlook, and we need the irrigation of our faith by the waters of other faiths which must find their consummation and their true solution in Christ. In the Cross we find the corrective to one-sided approaches to reality, but the Church cannot be truly Catholic without the contribution which India, China and the Muslim world can give.

This book is of real devotional value and should help to strengthen our faith in Christ while also helping us to acquire a more spacious sense of the wideness of God's mercy and the infinite wealth of goodness and traditional wisdom which the non-Christian world has to offer to the treasury of the Church.

L. M. SCHIFF.

SPENNYMOOR.

SHORTER NOTICES

Spiritual Well-Being Through Boys' Clubs. N.A.B.C. 1s. 3d.

A Preparation for Confirmation. By K. C. Thompson, R.N.V.R. C.L.A. 1s.

Definite Teaching on our Christian Faith and Practice. By W. J. Sexton. S.P.C.K. 6d.

Everyman's Religion. By Kenneth Mackenzie. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Here is the News. By M. P. G. Leonard. Craig and Wilson. 9d.

For Such a Time as This. By H. G. G. Herklots. Lutterworth Press. 4s. 6d.

What is an Evangelical? By Max Warren. Church Book Room. 9d.

It is good to find four London club leaders wanting the N.A.B.C. to undertake a more definite Christian policy in open boys' clubs. Their diagnosis of the situation will be read with interest and their recommendations and criticisms command respect. They clearly recognize that behaviour depends on belief, and consequently emphasize the importance of the club leaders holding firm Christian beliefs. They understand clearly, too, that the Sermon on the Mount is not the epitome of the Christian Gospel because, by itself, it spells despair, not good news. Yet these good club leaders still think of the Gospel in terms of enlightenment rather than redemption and so confuse doctrine with a later stage of theological formulation. So they consider Church membership, which they earnestly desire, as outside the club's concern. Surely some conception of redemption, however incoherent, and a corresponding response of loyalty to the redeemed community, is of

the very groundwork of Christian belief. Without it, club leaders must always find loyalty to the club coming before loyalty to the Church, and loyalty to themselves, whether to their belief or moral code, a dangerous rival to loyalty to Christ.

Mr Thompson, Canon Sexton, and Bishop Mackenzie all seem to err in the opposite direction to the club leaders. They are all at pains to inculcate an understanding loyalty to the Church, and so explain the sacraments vividly, but they do this without setting them sufficiently in their context of the whole Gospel of redemption. The first two writers do this purposely and produce useful pamphlets as far as they go, but their effectiveness will be lessened by a tendency to appear more like a religion of works than grace. Bishop Mackenzie covers all the ground, but it is disappointing to find such an able writer writing so dully of the fundamentals of the faith.

Among this collection of little books, most light of the Gospel appears to come through those oft-despised organs of theology, the B.B.C. and the B.C.C. The Provost of Glasgow has published six broadcast talks under the title of *Here is the News*. They are based on the great "I am" sayings of the Fourth Gospel, and expounded with telling illustration. Here, albeit in slight form, is the good news, and no one could fail to gather much from this pamphlet.

The first chapter of Mr Herklots' book is "The Right End of the Stick," and this is a fair comment on the whole book. Starting from the coming of our Lord as the fulfilment of the Old Testament and the beginning of a new age, he goes on naturally to the meaning of repentance and thence to the building of the new community. He describes the vicissitudes of the Church briefly but penetratingly, leading to the modern missionary expansion and the ecumenical movement. He writes with discrimination of the danger of undenominationalism on one hand and the need for showing the real unity of the Church on the other. The book shows some signs of hasty writing, and by the end it is apparent that Mr Herklots could have profitably written a longer book. This book, however, will certainly help Churchpeople to see the Gospel and the Church as a whole, and, because Mr Herklots has the right end of the stick, his book will also serve to commend the Gospel to those outside.

Many people of different views will read with interest Dr Warren's inquiry "What is an Evangelical?" He writes with a nice combination of conviction and humility, and begins by showing how evangelicals can make their proper contribution to the diversified unity of the Church. That proper contribution he states under four headings—the priority of evangelism, the need for conversion, trust in the Holy Spirit, and the priesthood of all believers. Perhaps a more specific discussion of the fundamental theological issues, such as the place of the Bible and the primacy of justification by faith, would have been more fruitful for our common understanding of the Gospel.

J. H. Churchill.

Camberwell.

Rebuilding Family Life in the Post-War World. Edited by Sir J. Marchant. Odhams Press. 2s.

Small Talks. By R. Selby Wright, S.C.F. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

Individual Salvation is Not Enough. By James Gray. Birmingham Christian Action Fellowship. 6d.

On the Need for a G.H.Q. for the Church of England. By F. A. Iremonger. Oxford University Press. 6d.

A Confession of Faith in Wartime. By Stephen Hobhouse. Society of Friends Peace Committee. 6d.

The Holy Catholic Church. An address to his Diocesan Conference by the Bishop of Gloucester.

The first book is a collection of essays by ten experts: each writes from the angle of his expertise without collaboration with his fellow-contributors. The result is an olympian salute and summons to the Common (mated) Man. It is not clear whether the book is written to guide those who are arranging for other people to have big families or for the parents themselves. It would have been better to use Dr Slater's article as a focus (since he does attempt to find out the reasons given by folk who favour small families) for the corporate attention of the experts. These could then have enlightened ignorance, challenged ill-will and made suggestions for social action to provide an environment favourable to expressed desires of those who are willing to have many children. As it is the big guns fire off with *éclat* but at a hazard.

The Common Man again is the radio objective of *Small Talks* given by Mr Wright, who is a service chaplain and also, I believe, a member of the Iona Community. He has therefore great experience in talking to inquirers and I would not venture to pass a judgment on his methods. But it may fairly be asked what is achieved if they are wholly successful—some ethical advice, some devotional guidance, some musings aptly related to doctrine. Friendly enough, but not true apologetic—where is the scandal, the biblical urgency, the fire of the Lord? To say that most of these talks are not frontal evangelistic attacks is no answer: there was fervour and power in four talks, on religion in the home, I heard given by Mr Geoffrey Hoyland. When Mr Wright does appeal to You, it is pietistic in the mode deprecated as inadequate for the times in *We Shall Rebuild.*

That "individual salvation is not enough" is cogently averred in a pamphlet for the converted, and the Dean of Lichfield calls for a G.H.Q. for the Church of England because the problems of thought and action are so complex for ordinary Christians. He wants a score of Christian professional people to suggest in what directions the Church should throw her weight. This is all right if an attempt has first been made at understanding, as for example by the Christian Frontier or the Christendom Group. Otherwise, as Schumpeter says of Voltaire, the G.H.Q. may exhibit "an inerring instinct for and a wholesome acceptance of the humors of the time."

The theme of Charles Williams' *The Forgiveness of Sins* is recalled by Mr Hobhouse's sub-title, "being chiefly thoughts concerning human unity, retribution and forgiveness." Those who begin to ponder on

forgiveness through this pacifist pamphlet should go on to read that book. Much of what Mr Hobhouse contends for is accepted by non-pacifists—see for example Dr Fisher's victory sermon in St Paul's on the defilement of war. On p. 6 the author distinguishes between the personal and the impersonal rule of God, but he will not allow a similar and necessary duality in the action of believers. Thus it is not possible to withhold punishment until you are sure it is "wholly remedial in purpose and working." Indeed, an altruistic punitive aim may lead in practice to a reaction of extreme harshness towards criminals—cp. *The Yogi and the Commissar* for the Soviet switch-over.

Dr Headlam's address is an essay towards (to use the current diffident preposition) reunion. He maintains that all communions are schismatical and also that the Lambeth Quadrilateral expresses four catholic principles. This is an impasse. There is no healing of the schism for us without acceptance of these principles and there are communions which reject them. We are no whit nearer reunion. Maybe it is like happiness and comes when it is not deliberately sought.

Ashbrittle. M. P. Ralph-Bowman.

Introducing the New Testament. By A. M. Hunter. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Of its kind—a scholar's offering of a popular appetizer to the study of the New Testament for the "ordinary reader"—this little book by Dr Hunter is quite good. It provides answers to the sort of questions the beginner might be expected to ask; and it provides them in a clear and readable form—though I wonder whether it is necessary in writing for the "ordinary reader" to use such expressions as "clap it roundly." But the answers are selected in accordance with the author's particular viewpoint: the New Testament is "neither *belles lettres*, nor superfine ethics, nor even lofty views about God, but Good News from God. . . . And to this day, when simple men and women go to the New Testament, this is what they seek . . . they seek news of what Karl Barth calls a 'vertical miracle.' Beset behind and before with sin and guilt . . . they seek 'a Word from the Beyond for our human predicament.' . . . That is to say, the importance of the New Testament is that it claims to be the record of a unique self-revelation of the living God on the stage of history." This viewpoint we may believe to be right; but it should not release us from the obligation to reckon with other possible answers. I think Dr Hunter has not given his beginners a sufficient insight into the complexity of the problems involved; they might be led to suppose that the whole matter is very simple, and to be left unaware of how weightily supported have been some of the alternative solutions of the critical problems involved.

I am inclined to think that we have, at any rate for the time being, had enough of these little "Barthian" or "semi-Barthian" appetizers. What is now urgently needed is a "big" work in English to give a reasoned justification for the modern theological premises about the New Testament, and in the light of these premises, if they can be satisfactorily justified, to re-examine the whole field of what we know as the Higher Criticism of the New Testament. L. J. Collins.

R.A.F.

INDEX TO VOLUME XLVIII

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1945

PAGE

Agape and Eros 98

Baptism with Water and with the Holy Ghost 246
Basic English, A Note on 39
BENNETT, F. 73
BOLTON, F. R. 80

BOOKS REVIEWED:

Addison, *The Christian Approach to the Moslem* (G. W. Broomfield) . . 138
Bentley, *Reform of the Ecclesiastical Law* (E. Kemp) 135
Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom* (D. R. Davies) 115
Brandreth and Bailey, *Celibacy and Marriage* (A. Blair) 43
Bruce, *Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?* (C. F. Evans) . . . 17
Butterworth, *Spiritualism and Religion* (R. H. Thouless) 211
Buxton, *Prophets of Heaven and Hell* (M. Belgion) 260
Cave, *The Christian Estimate of Man* (J. Burnaby) 20
Cirlot, *Christ and Divorce* (R. Mortimer) 209
Clarke, *Eighteenth Century Piety* (N. Sykes) 134
Cross, *The Study of St Athanasius* (J. E. L. Oulton) 212
Dickie, *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (M. P. Ralph-Bowman) . . 163
Dispensation in Practice and Theory (G. B. Bentley) 86
Dugmore (Ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) . . 68
Dyer, *All ye that pass by* (S. M. Gibbard) 186
Emmet, *The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking* (E. L. Mascall) . . . 133
Evans, *The Churches in the U.S.S.R.* (B. H. G. Wormald) 162
Fairweather, *The Word as Truth* (H. I. Davies) 94
Fosdick, *A Great Time to be Alive* (C. Gardner) 282
Foster, *World Church* (L. M. Schiff) 161
Green, *The Pre-Mundane Fall* (G. E. P. Cox) 185
Hanson and Harvey, *The Loom of God* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) . . . 187
Hayman, *Worship and the Common Life* (R. H. Daubney) 111
Heard, *A Preface to Prayer* (G. Shaw) 188
Hildebrandt, *This is the Message* (H. P. Kingdon) 71
Hiltner, *Clinical Pastoral Training* (G. L. Russell) 279
Hoare, *The Original Order and Chapters of St John's Gospel* (R. H. Fuller) . 117
Hole, *Witchcraft in England* (L. Dewar) 213
Hollis, *Fossett's Memory* (M. Belgion) 139
Hooft, *The Struggle of the Dutch Church* (M. P. Ralph-Bowman) . . 163
Horner, *The Book of the Discipline* (F. H. Smith) 114
Jalland, *The Bible, the Church and South India* (A. M. Ramsey) . . . 159
Kerr (Ed.), *Compends of Calvin and Luther* (E. G. Rupp) 255
Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul* (W. L. Knox) 90
Laing, *Dom Bernard Clements* (L. W. Grensted) 137
Lamb, *Son of Adam* (A. Sampson) 21
Lampert, *The Divine Realm* (C. Williams) 41
Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (D. M. Emmet) 236
Latourette, *The Unquenchable Light* (L. M. Schiff) 161
Layard, *The Lady of the Hare* (L. W. Grensted) 119
Lebreton and Zeiller, *History of the Primitive Church* (H. E. Symonds) . 118
Lewis, *Beyond Personality* (H. C. L. Heywood) 66
McDermott and Webb, *Irish Protestantism* (R. B. McDowell) . . . 239
Macdonald, *The Interpreter Spirit* (E. Evans) 69
Macmillan, *What is Christian Marriage?* (R. Mortimer) 63
Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers (W. O. Chadwick) 259
Maritain, *Christianity and Democracy* (G. Gibson) 190
Maritain, *The Rights of Man* (H. C. L. Heywood) 66
Marneau, *The Wounds of the Apostles* (A. Sampson) 21
Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice* (R. H. Daubney) 111
May, *Cardinal Newman* (A. C. Scupholme) 236

PAGE

Monahan, *St Thomas Aquinas on the Sacraments* (R. H. Daubney) . . 111
Moorman, *Church Life in the Eighteenth Century* (F. J. E. Raby) . . . 253
Murry, *Adam and Eve* (H. C. L. Heywood) 66
Nash, *The Universities in the Modern World* (H. S. Buss) 182
Nicholson, *The Fire of the Lord* (A. Sampson) 47
Orthodox Spirituality (F. P. Harton) 281
Payne, *The Fellowship of Believers* (E. G. Rupp) 255
Payne, *The Free Church Tradition* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 19
Peck, *Living Worship* (R. H. Daubney) 111
Percy, *The Unknown State* (G. Leibholz) 45
Phythian-Adams, *The Way of At-one-ment* (L. M. Schiff) 161
Porter, *The English Eucharist* (A. H. Couratin) 257
Predicament of the Church, The (F. W. Camfield) 93
Quick, *The Gospel of the New World* (A. C. Scupholme) 42
Raynes, *Called by God* (F. P. Harton) 240
Reckitt (Ed.), *Prospect for Christendom* (E. W. Brewin) 206
Rieger, *The Silent Church* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 19
Seaver, *Albert Schweitzer* (L. W. Grensted) 137
Sedding, *Godfrey Callaway* (G. Simon) 258
Shaw, *A Pilgrim's Book of Prayers* (W. O. Chadwick) 259
Simpson, *St Augustine's Episcopate* (J. Burnaby) 92
Slesser, *Order and Disorder* (F. J. E. Raby) 184
Smyth, *The Friendship of Christ* (C. F. D. Moule) 116
Sparks, *The Old Testament in the Christian Church* (F. S. Marsh) . . 89
Spens, *The Things which Cannot be Shaken* (M. P. Ralph-Bowman) . . 163
Stevenson, *In Our Tongues* (C. Gardner) 165
Storrs, *Many Creeds: One Cross* (L. M. Schiff) 283
Sykes, *The Study of Ecclesiastical History* (A. R. Vidler) 261
Tasker, *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels* (C. F. Evans) . . . 17
Towards the Conversion of England (G. L. Phillips) 234
Underhill, *Light of Christ* (S. M. Gibbard) 186
Vann, *The Heart of Man* (H. Balmforth) 96
Warren, *But—Suppose He was Right?* (S. M. Gibbard) 186
Warren, *The Calling of God* (L. M. Schiff) 113
Werfel, *Paul among the Jews* (A. Sampson) 21
Williams, *The House of the Octopus* (A. Sampson) 238
Wodehouse, *One Kind of Religion* (H. I. Davies) 94
Wright, *A Book of Words for Padres* (F. Bennett) 22
York, Archbishop of, *The Christian Churches and International Peace* (G. Gibson) 190
Zernov, *Three Russian Prophets* (B. H. G. Wormald) 162

Can We Forgive? 121
Caroline Theology, The Structure of 243, 265
Cheerfulness Breaks in 50
Church and the Artist, The 36
Church's Pastoral Task Today, The 170
CLARKE, W. K. L. 39, 77, 177
Correspondence 120, 168, 230, 272
Country Preaching 202

Doctrine of Confirmation, The 194

Empty Tomb, The 77

HANSON, R. 174
HARTFORD, R. R. 55
HAWKINS, R. H. 232
High Churchmen and High Statesmen 145

"*If I was Archbishop*" 11
Indiscriminate Confirmation 73

PAGE

King, William, The Man and his Work 55
KNIGHT, H. 224

Liturgy and Community 151
LUMB, J. R. 15, 158

MCADOO, H. R. 243, 265
MCDERMOTT, R. P. 217
MEIKLEJOHN, K. W. 85
MILFORD, T. R. 121
Modern Miracle Play, A 157
Moses in the Typology of St Paul 174
MOULE, C. F. D. 246
MOZLEY, J. K. 6, 30

Neglected Page in Anglican Theology, A 104
NEWTON, E. 36

Parish Church Cathedrals 179
Poet of Gentle Depths, A 268
Punishment of War Criminals, The 232

Quick as a Theologian, Oliver 6, 30

RAMSEY, A. M. 2, 194
RATCLIFF, E. C. 129
Renan, Ernest 224
Resuscitating the Decalogue, On 25
ROBINSON, J. A. T. 98

S. A. C. 11
St Peter's Silence on the Petrine Claims 15
SAMPSON, A. 268
SCUPHOLME, A. C. 202
Shape of the Liturgy, The 127
SHEFFIELD, BISHOP OF 179
Shorter Notices 23, 47, 140, 166, 214, 262
SMART, D. A. 60
STANFORD, W. B. 15
Sunday Morning Service 131, 168, 191
Survey of Educational Books 15, 158
SWANSEA AND BRECON, BISHOP OF 50

The 1949 Prayer Book 80, 120, 192
THOMPSON, R. C. 170

VEREKER, C. 151
Via Media, The 217
VIDLER, A. R. 25, 145

What is Anglican Theology? 2
Who are made Diocesan Bishops? 60

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons, Ltd., Guildford and Esher